

COMMEMORATION VOLUME

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE PROFESSORSHIP
OF SCIENCE OF RELIGION
IN
TOKYO IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY

EDITED

By

THE CELEBRATION COMMITTEE

1934

THE HERALD PRESS, LTD.

TOKYO

power to reflect on his past life and on the progress of his science during the past decades, as well as to do even a little further for Science and Humanity!

MASAHARU ANESAKI

Tokyo, July, 1933.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

| | |
|---|-----|
| Die Rolle des Denkens im religiösen Glauben unter dem Gesichtspunkt moderner Kultur..... | 1 |
| Anathon Aall , Professor an der Universität Oslo. | |
| De l'invocation à l'incantation ; Coup d'œil sur les Manifestations les plus archaïques du fait religieux | 16 |
| Raoul Allier , Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante, Paris. | |
| Man and the stars | 55 |
| Herbert H. Gowen , Professor in the University of Washington. | |
| Astronomical similes in epic poetry | 71 |
| E. Washburn Hopkins , The Late Professor in Yale University. | |
| Bilaṅga-dutiya | 84 |
| Sylvain Lévi , Professeur au Collège de France. | |
| Religion and theologies, in their relation to the science of religion | 96 |
| Edward C. Moore , Professor in Harvard University. | |
| Mystische und gläubige Frömmigkeit | 134 |
| Rudolf Otto , Professor an der Universität Marburg. | |
| Der „Grosse Brief“ des Heiligen Franz Xaver | 178 |
| Georg Schurhammer , S. J. | |
| Assurance in religion | 220 |
| Nathan Söderblom , The Late Chancellor of University of Upsala. | |
| Isson-kyō, eine unbekannte Volksreligion in Japan | 228 |
| Tomonobu Ishibashi , A. O. Professor an der kaiserlichen Universität zu Tokyo. | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| A collection of the Sūtra-elements from the Kāṭhakam (Prolegomena) | 243 |
| Naoshiro Fukushima , Assistant Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |

II

Résumés of the articles in the Japanese edition of the
COMMEMORATION VOLUME (edited in Tokyo, 1930).

| | |
|---|-----|
| Religious ideals and actualities of life..... | 273 |
| Masaharu Anesaki , Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| Die Anfänge der Religionswissenschaft | 280 |
| Chijo Akamatsu , Professor an der kaiserlichen Universität zu Keijo. | |
| Les opuscules d'Auguste Comte..... | 282 |
| Hidekage Akamatsu , Professeur à l'Université Risho, Tokyo. | |
| Gott als der Seiende | 285 |
| Seiichi Hatano , Professor an der kaiserlichen Universität zu Kyoto. | |
| L'idée de la mort chez les peuples non-civilisés..... | 288 |
| Toshiaki Harada , Chargé de cours à l'Université Impériale de Tokyo. | |
| Is Nāgārjuna the author of the A-Kuto-Bhayā? | 291 |
| Chōtatsu Ikeda , Lecturer in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| Über die historische Entwicklung des buddhistischen „Bewusstseins“..... | 294 |
| Ryujo Kambayashi , Professor an der Taisho Universität, Tokyo. | |
| Characteristics of the Shinto religion viewed in the light of the science of religion..... | 302 |
| Genchi Kato , Formerly Assistant Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| On the influence of Patañjali upon Yogasūtra (particularly on Sarvāstivādin) | 304 |
| Taiken Kimura , The Late Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| Apollo Sauroctonus — A study | 308 |
| Takeo Matsumura , Lecturer in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| The conception of 'Abhidharma' viewed from the standpoint of 'Ultimate Middle' | 315 |
| Shoson Miyamoto , Assistant Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| On Pāli Buddhism | 322 |
| Makoto Nagai , Assistant Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| The formation of the early Christian community and its life | 324 |
| Katsuya Sano , Professor in Kyushu Imperial University, Fukuoka. | |
| Epistemological Buddhism | 327 |
| Benkio Shiio , Professor in Taisho University, Tokyo. | |
| The absolute consciousness and the problem of evil..... | 332 |
| Ryuji Suzuki , Professor in Meiji University, Tokyo. | |
| The central question of the controversy on the subject of Buddhata (i. e. Buddha-Nature)..... | 338 |
| Daijō Tokiwa , Formerly Professor in Tokyo Imperial University. | |
| Der Ursprung der Trairūpyalingatheorie in der indischen Logik | 343 |
| Hakuju Ui , Professor an der kaiserlichen Universität zu Tokyo. | |
| L'origine du sacrifice humain et de la chasse-aux-têtes | 346 |
| Enkū Uno , Professeur adjoint à l'Université Impériale de Tokyo. | |
| The teaching of the Third Stage and Japanese Buddhism ... | 353 |
| Keiki Yabuki , Lecturer in Tokyo Imperial University. | |

ON THE INFLUENCE OF PATAÑJALI UPON YOGASŪTRA. (PARTICULARLY ON SARVĀSTIVĀDIN)

Taiken KIMURA.

A. The followings are the teachings of Yogasūtra which are common to those of Buddhism or at least similar to them.

1) The classification of samādhi or samāpatti into savitarka, savicāra, nirvitarka and nirvicāra (Sūtra I. 17, 1. 42-44) resembles very much to the classification of samādhi in Buddhism into (1) savitarka savicāra samādhi (2) avitarka vicāramātra samādhi and (3) avitarka-avicāra samādhi.

2) Śraddhā, vīrya, smṛti, samādhi and prajñā (Sūtra I. 20) are at one with the 5 indriyas, or 5 balas in Buddhism.

3) Maitrī, karuṇā, muditā, and upekṣā (Sūtra I. 33) agree with the 4 species of apramāṇa in Buddhism.

4) The explanation of avidyā in Sūtra II. 5 is quite in agreement with the 4 kinds of viparyāsa which is the special teaching of Buddhism. Particularly the parable in Vyāsa that avidyā is like amitra is found only in Vasubandhus' Abhidharma-kośa vol. 10. (tr. by Hiouen-thsang.)

5) It is explained (Sūtra II. 12) that dṛṣṭājanmavedanīya and adṛṣṭājanmavedanīya have their origin in karmāśaya which depends on klēsa and that they are the result (vipāka) of karmāśaya. Especially in the comment of Vyāsa an effort is made to solve the problem "Is one karma the cause of one birth (janma) or

one karma the cause of more than one birth, or more than one karma the cause of more than one birth?" And in the comment of Sūtra II. 13, *niyata-vipāka*, *aniyata-vipāka* are explained. All these explanations are quite similar to the Buddhist explanation of karma in *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣaśāstra* vols. 19-20 (tr. by Hiouen-thsang.)

6) The passage in which *pariṇāmaduḥkha*, *tāpaduḥkha*, and *saṃskāraduḥkha* are explained as the causes of *duḥkha* (Sūtra II. 15) is just identical with the theory of *traya-duḥkhatā* in Buddhism.

7) The explanation of *vimukti prajñāyāḥ*, and *citta vimukti* (Sūtra II. 27) is quite similar to the explanation of *paññāvimutti* (*prajñāvimukti*) and *cetovimutti* (*cittavimukti*) in Buddhism. Particularly the explanation of *vimukti prajñāyāḥ* is quite the same with that of *kṣaya-jñāna*, and *anutpāda-jñāna* in Buddhism.

8) The explanations in Sūtra III. 9-15 and also in Sūtra IV. 13-14 have a close relation with Buddhism, which I intend to discuss later.

9) *Janma*, *oṣadhi*, *mantra*, *tapas*, *saṃādhi* which are explained in Sūtra IV. 1 as the means of gaining *siddhi* are just the same with the means of gaining *ṛddhi-viṣaya-jñāna* explained in *Abhidharmakośa* vol. 27.

10) Karma is divided into *kṛṣṇa*, *śuklakṛṣṇa*, *śukla*, *aśukla*, *akṛṣṇa* in Sūtra IV. 7. And this is quite similar with the 4 kinds of karma in Buddhism.

11) *Dharmameghasamādhi* (Sūtra IV. 29) is the title of *Bhūmi X* of *Bodhisattva*.

12) The *nirālambanavāda* is objected in *Yogasūtra*. (IV.

14-21) And the object of this hostile criticism seems to be Vijñāna-vāda Buddhism.

These instances I have above mentioned are, I believe, most exhaustive in a sense, and they are much more in number than those which have ever been noticed by any other scholars.

B. It is stated in the comment of Vyāsa (Sūtra III. 9-14. IV. 12-13) that past, present and future are only the forms of different manifestation of the phenomena (dharma). However they exist as dharmin or dravya in the three time forms. And I believe that I am the first to affirm that this advocacy is quite similar to that of Sarvāstivādin, one of the Hīnayāna school. According to Patañjali Vyāsa dharmin or dravya needs these steps for its realization. The first step is to phenomenalyze as phenomena in general (dharmā-pariṇāma, or bhāva-pariṇāma). The second step is to phenomenalyze as things determined by successive times (lakṣaṇa-pariṇāma) and the third step is to phenomenalyze as things determined by intensity (avasthā-pariṇāma). In Buddhism, however, according to Mahā-vibhāṣāśāstra (vol. 77) and Abhidharmakośaśāstra (vol. 20) “tryadhvānadharmāḥ sarvadā santi” is the teaching taught by the four great teachers. They taught their own views independently using parables for their own illustrations. The first teacher Dharma-trāta maintains that the division of the three time forms is the difference of the state of being, and not the difference of the substance (dravya). The second teacher Ghoṣa maintains that the division of the three time forms is the difference of attribute. The third teacher Vasumitra says that it is the difference of position (avasthā). And the fourth teacher Buddhadeva maintains that it is nothing but a difference of points

of view (apekṣā).

And now let me here compare these theories with the explanations in the Patañjali-Vyāsa. According to the Patañjali-Vyāsa dharma (or bhāva), lakṣaṇa, and avasthā are the three stages of the continual development of the substance. And according to Vaibhāṣikas of Sarvāstivāda, dharma, lakṣaṇa and avasthā are “the difference affected by the difference of view-point.” Herein lies the difference of the two. But they both recognize the existence of the substance through the three time forms, and besides this the parable of Vyāsa is quite similar to that of Mahā-vibhāṣaśāstra, (with regard to the decimal system in the parable of Vyāsa Prof. Woods says “the oldest instance of the use of the decimal system is in the Gurjara inscription of A. D. 595.” But this is the opinion which we find in Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣaśāstra which is considered to have been compiled in about 150 A. D.).

C. As for the reason for this similarity between Buddhism and Yogasūtra I decidedly claim that it is due to the fact that Patañjali utilized the doctrines of Buddhism in setting up its own theory though it took the theory of Sāṅkhya chiefly. Vyāsa especially reformed its own theory influenced by Mahā-vibhāṣa directly and indirectly. And this causes the similarity of the parables with those of the four great teachers of Mahā-vibhāṣa. And though I can not be positive, it is certain that Vyāsa has been influenced by the doctrine of Sarvāstivāda through Abhidharma-kośa-śāstra of Vasubandhu. At any rate it is a manifest fact that both Patañjali and Vyāsa have been influenced by Buddhism. Particularly it is appropriate to think that they have been influenced by Buddhism through Abhidharma rather than Buddhist Sūtra,